UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VISA INC. and VISA U.S.A. INC. APPLE INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-013501

U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539

PATENT OWNER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO AMEND

DOCKE

Δ

¹ Apple Inc., which filed a petition in IPR2019-00727, has been joined as a party to this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I.	MTA PRESENTS A REASONABLE NUMBER OF CLAIMS1		
II.	PETITIONER'S ARGUMENTS FOR DENIAL OF MTA BASED ON DUTY OF CANDOR VIOLATIONS AND ESTOPPEL LACK MERIT		
III.	SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS HAVE WRITTEN SUPPORT		
	A.	Limitations 39[c], 48[a], 51[d], 52[pre] Have Written Support3	
	B.	Limitations 46[b] and 52[c] Have Written Description Support8	
	C.	Limitations 40[b] and 46[d] Have Written Description Support9	
	D.	Limitation 51[b] Has Written Description Support10	
IV.	SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER PRIOR ART10		
	А.	Brener Teaches Away From Limitations 39[c], 48[a], 51[d], 52[pre] and Petitioner Further Fails to Explain Why A POSITA Would Be Motivated To Combine Brener with Desai10	
	B.	Desai and Pare Fail to Teach Limitations 39[e] and 47[b]16	
	C.	Brener and Schneier Fail to Disclose Limitations 40[b], 46[c][d]19	
	D.	Brener Fails to Disclose "Public ID Code" (Limitation 52[f][g])21	
V.	THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE UNDER § 10123		
VI.	THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS SATISFY 35 U.S.C. § 112		
VII.	CONCLUSION		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP, 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	21
Continental Circuits LLC v. Intel Corp. et al., No. 2018-1076	6, 7
In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	21
SDI Technologies, Inc. v. Bose Corp., IPR2014-00346 (June 11, 2015)	2
Universal Secure Registry, LLC v. Apple, Inc., 1:17-cv-00585-JFB-SRF (D. Del. Sep. 18, 2018)	23

RULES AND REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3)	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)(3)(i)	1

PATENT OWNER'S LIST OF EXHIBITS

Ex. 2001	Declaration of Dr. Markus Jakobsson in Support of
	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response.
Ex. 2002	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Markus Jakobsson.
Ex. 2003	Terminal Disclaimer Dated August 17, 2018.
Ex. 2004	Declaration of Dr. Markus Jakobsson in Support of
	Patent Owner's Response.
Ex. 2005	Transcript of Dr. J. Douglas Tygar Deposition Dated
	April 19, 2019.
Ex. 2006	N. Asokan, et. al, The State of the Art in Electronic
	Payment Systems, IEEE Computer, Vol. 30, No. 9, pp.
	28-35 (IEEE Computer Society Press, Sept. 1997).
Ex. 2007	M. Baddeley, Using E-Cash in the New Economy: An
	Economic Analysis of Micropayment Systems, J.
	Electronic Commerce Research, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 239-
	253 (Nov. 2004).
Ex. 2008	U.S. Application No. 11/768,729.
Ex. 2009	U.S. Application No. 09/710,703.
Ex. 2010	Declaration of Dr. Markus Jakobsson in Support of
	Motion to Amend.
Ex. 2011	Declaration of Dr. Markus Jakobsson in Support of
	Patent Owner's Reply to Opposition of Conditional
	Motion to Amend
Ex. 2012	U.S. District Court for Delaware Report and
	Recommendation.

Universal Secure Registry LLC ("Patent Owner") submits this Reply in support of its Conditional Motion to Amend, Paper 13 ("MTA"), and in response to Petitioner's Opposition to the MTA, Paper 17 ("Opp.").

I. MTA PRESENTS A REASONABLE NUMBER OF CLAIMS

Title 35 U.S.C. § 316(d) allows PO to file one motion to amend having a reasonable number of substitute claims per instituted IPR proceeding. Here, PO's MTA submits one substitute claim for each of challenged claims 1-4, 9, 16, 21-25, 31, 37, and 38, which is presumptively a reasonable number of substitute claims. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3).

Petitioner ("VISA") complains that if *other* substitute claims for the '539 patent are granted in *another* currently pending IPR proceeding (IPR2018-00812), Petitioner will have had no opportunity to be heard. *See* Opp. at 2. VISA has no right to be heard in a proceeding before this Board for which it is not a petitioner. Petitioner also wrongly implies that the present MTA is defective because it does not allegedly "explain whether the requested amendments are patentably distinct from those sought in the Apple CMTA." *See id.* The Rules preclude a patent owner from obtaining in any patent a claim that is not patentably distinct from a "finally refused or canceled claim." 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)(3)(i). But a claim is not *finally* refused and estoppel does not apply according to § 42.73(d)(3)(i) until the claims at

DOCKET A L A R M



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.